

4813

**OEPA COMMENTS ON THE O.U. 3 PROPOSED
PLAN**

10/12/93

**OEPA/DOE-FN
8
COMMENTS**



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District Office

40 South Main Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2086
(513) 285-6357
FAX (513) 285-6404

LOG H-6259
FILE AK
LIBRA
OCT 15 10 13 AM '93

48 13

George V. Voinovich
Governor

October 12, 1993

Mr. Jack R. Craig
Project Manager
U.S. DOE FEMP
P.O. Box 398705
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8705

Dear Mr. Craig:

Attached are Ohio EPA comments on the O.U. 3 Proposed Plan. Some of these comments were previously submitted in draft form and additional comments are included in this submittal.

If you have any questions about these comments, please contact Tom Schneider or me.

Sincerely,

Graham E. Mitchell
Project Manager

GEM/klj

cc: Jenifer Kwasniewski, DERR
Tom Schneider, DERR
Jim Saric, USEPA
Ken Alkema, FERMCO
Lisa August, GeoTrans
Jean Michaels, PRC
Robert Owen, ODH

0 01



OEPA COMMENTS ON
OU3 PROPOSED PLAN

General Comments

1. DOE fails to justify within the document the need for specifying a disposal facility at this time. DOE should not be limiting itself to a single disposal facility. DOE must keep available and consider the option of disposal at a permitted commercial facility. DOE should delete reference to the Nevada Test Site from the document unless substantial justification can be provided for its inclusion.
2. It does not seem necessary for DOE to limit itself with regard to the amount of waste which may receive off-site disposal. DOE's reasoning for limiting off-site disposal to 10 % of waste generated is unclear. As previous experience has shown us, the RI/FS process is fraught with delays. DOE should maintain flexibility with regard to off-site disposal volume in order to allow decontamination and demolition to continue should the OU3 ROD be delayed.
3. The text is unclear and tends to be contradictory at times concerning whether this interim remedial action will address below-grade structures. It would seem that below grade structures would be best left to the final ROD and thus coordinated with OU5. Whichever DOE is proposing, include/exclude below-grade structures, the text must be revised to clearly state the objectives and all required coordination with OU5.
4. According to USEPA's "Guidance on Preparing Superfund Decision Documents" (7/89), Proposed Plans for interim remedial actions need not include quantitative risk information (Section 9.2). Since an acceptable risk assessment has not been performed for OU3, it would seem reasonable for DOE to only include qualitative risk information in the Proposed Plan, as suggested in USEPA guidance. As discussed below, Ohio EPA has significant concerns with DOE's "risk assessment" calculations presented in the Proposed Plan. Ohio EPA recommends revising the document to simply address qualitative risk information.
5. In regards to the disposal of building materials from plant 7, reuse and/or recycling should be evaluated. Certain building components have commercial value as either recyclable material or components like structural steel could be sold for reuse. If this material is demolished, cut up, and packaged for disposal it eliminates the recycle & reuse options.

Specific Comments

1. Section 2.1, pg. 2-6, 4th paragraph: The text should note

48-138

that the initial study of Indiana bats on the FEMP was inconclusive due to low capture success and echolocation detector data suggesting the presence of bats from the same genus. The data suggest additional studies should be conducted to determine the bats use of FEMP property. Such information will become more important during remedy selection and design phases of all operable units. The text should also discuss any action being taken to clarify the issue.

2. Section 2.4.2.1, HWMUs: The section indicates that HWMUs will be addressed under CERCLA interim remedial action utilizing appropriate ARAR's. This section makes mention of current discussions between DOE FEMP and OEPA concerning integration of RCRA closure requirements into the CERCLA process. As always, DOE FEMP is free to proceed at their own risk in regard to closure/remediation of HWMUs. At this time, integration issues are in the discussion stage only. Therefore, HWMUs and all structures, materials, and demolition wastes from within these units are subject to the RCRA closure requirements of OAC 3735-66.
3. Section 3.3, pg. 3-3, line 16: The text should reference Alternative 2 rather than Alternative 3.
4. Section 3.4, pg. 3-9, 2nd paragraph: As stated previously, Ohio EPA does not believe it is necessary or prudent to define a disposal facility at this time.
5. Section 3.4, pg. 3-9, 3rd paragraph: As stated previously, Ohio EPA does not believe it is necessary or prudent to limit the amount of material to be disposed/treated/recycled off-site under this action.
6. Section 3-4, pg. 3-9, lines 28-30: DOE must include waste minimization requirements along with resource recovery and recycling into plans for each activity. Revise the text to state "...employing resource recovery and recycle and waste minimization would be... ."
7. Figure 3-2, pg. 3-11: The figure suggests that under the maximum storage scenario TSSs may be constructed over or near an identified Hazardous Waste Management Unit (Fire Training Facility). Ground water is contaminated with both radionuclides and organics in the area. Construction of the storage facility may not occur in a manner to prevent or be inconsistent with any response action for cleanup/closure of the FTF. DOE should consider expediting and expanding the scope of the FTF Removal Action to ensure remediation of the area in a timeframe sufficient to meet the needs of OU3 for

OEPA Comments
October 8, 1993
Page 3

storage.

8. Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 4-10, lines 15-17: DOE fails to justify the use of "fatal cancers" rather than USEPA's standard as defined in the NCP of "cancer incidence". The risks calculated and discussed within this document do not appear to be consistent with the Risk Assessment Work Plan Addendum.
9. Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 4-11, lines 11-13: DOE should provide a reference and justification for the use of the dose-to-risk conversion factor.
10. Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 4-11, lines 28-29: DOE must state within this paragraph that the risk numbers are not directly comparable. Fatal cancers are being compared to cancer incidence.
11. Section 4.3.4.1, pg. 4-12, 3rd paragraph: DOE fails to provide sufficient basis for the assumption that chemical risks are less than those of radionuclides. In light of the substantial volume of asbestos present within OU3, it would seem this contaminant would present a considerable risk factor.
12. Section 4.4.4, pg. 4-19, 1st paragraph: As stated previously, it is unclear whether the proposed remedial action includes removal of below-grade structures. This paragraph shows the confusion with regard to below-grade structures throughout the document.
13. Section 4.4.4.1, pg. 4-19, Last paragraph: DOE fails to justify the fact that no difference in exposure/risk is expected between Alternative 2 and 3. It would seem, since the difference between the actions is significant, that additional risk might result from discharges during building demolition, waste transport and storage.
14. Section 4.4.4.1, pg. 4-21, 3rd paragraph: As stated previously, any comparison to USEPA's risk range must be preface by a statement referencing the comparison of fatal cancers to that of cancer incidence.
15. Section 4.4.4.1, pg. 4-21, last paragraph: Defining volumes allowable for off-site disposal and the disposal location are unnecessary and a potential liability.
16. Section 4.4.4.1, pg. 4-22, 2nd paragraph: The paragraph should be revised to maintain consistent units throughout (i.e., either cubic yards or cubic feet).

OEPA Comments
October 8, 1993
Page 4

17. Table 4-7, pg. 4-25: The table fails to account for any chemical risk posed by the alternative. The text should reiterate the fact that risk of cancer incidence may be substantially under estimated.
18. Section 6.2, pg. 6-4, lines 7-8: The statement that no unique wildlife habitat or species are known on the site is incorrect. State threatened and endangered species have been identified on-site as well as "excellent habitat" for the federally endangered Indiana Bat. DOE should delete the sentence. It is probable that "no unique wildlife habitat or species" occur within the areas of proposed activity. If this is the intent of the sentence, it should be clarified.
19. Section 8.0, pg. 8-1: DOE fails to provide justification for taking 6 months to complete the Draft IROD following approval of and public comment on the Proposed Plan. The reason for such a delay should be provided within the text.
20. Section 9.0, pg. 9-3, DOE 1993c: It is unclear where this document is referenced within the text. DOE should not reference a document which has not been submitted yet.
21. Appendix A, Table A-1, pg. A-16: DOE must update the list of MCL's and MCLG's to be the most current standards.
22. Appendix A, Table A-2, pg. A-24: Add Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 404.
23. Appendix A, Page A-27 identifies (in the Potential ARAR column) 40 CFR 264 as ARAR. The equivalent section of the OAC should be cited.
24. Appendix A: As applicable, page A-28 should cite OAC 3745-56-20 through 56-60 in regard to waste piles.
25. Appendix E, Section E.1, pg. E-3: DOE should delete references to soil in this section since OU3 only applies to building debris. Removing references to soil would clarify the storage options for the debris to be generated under the proposed interim remedial action.
26. Appendix E, Section E.2, pg. E-4, lines 3-7: DOE should discuss the impacts of the FTF contamination and remediation/closure upon the construction of the storage facilities.
27. Appendix E, Section E.3, lines 12-21: DOE should either provide additional detail as to the design and construction of the CSF or state that such detail will be provided within a

OEPA Comments
October 8, 1993
Page 5

RD/RA work plan following the ROD. Detail should be provided concerning waste segregation and storage. A description of storage requirements for asbestos containing materials..

28. Appendix E, Section E.5, lines 9-11: DOE should clarify why a discussion of soil storage within the CSF is included in this document. The document should address debris generated as a result the proposed interim remedial action.

- 29) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 2.1 Pg #: 2-3 Line #: 5-12 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: The paragraph does not clearly state the problem associated with airborne contaminants. Storage and handling activities should not be a major cause of airborne contamination if it is then DOE will need to revise their work practices. The statement could be revised to read containerizing or packaging along with the remedial aspects. Airborne particles do not always settle next to the source. DOE's statement is misleading as to the potential for deposition of airborne particles. Particles carried by air currents can be carried off property rather easily then deposited. In addition, add "and work practices" to the last sentence.
Response:
Action:
- 30) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 2.4.2.2 Pg #: 2-19 Line #: 20 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: Material containing percentages greater than 1% asbestos are considered ACM. The statement seems to downplay the risks associated with ACM because of the varying percentages in the sampled matrix.
Response:
Action:
- 31) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 2.4.2.2 Pg #: 2-19 Line #: 23 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: The microbial organism associated with pigeon guano is not a chemical contaminant.
Response:
Action:
- 32) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 3.3 Pg #: 3-2 Line #: 3 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: Are there any components other than USTs or basins that are below-grade with exposed surfaces? Why will only above-grade components be decontaminated?
Response:

OEPA Comments
October 8, 1993
Page 6

Action:

- 33) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 3.4 Pg #: 3-8 Line #: 9 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: Attempting to seal an entire structure and implement engineering controls to control airborne contaminants is not always a cost, labor or safety effective approach. Too large a work zone can cause recontamination of decontaminated areas by the settling of particles generated by decontamination activities. Several technologies exist, such as vacuum blasting, that can be utilized for these tasks to minimize airborne contamination.
Response:
Action:
- 34) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 4.2 Pg #: 4-5 Line #: 12 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: In addition to the radionuclides, workers will be exposed to asbestos fibers from the ACM and, possibly, pathogenic organisms from the fecal material being deposited inside the structures.
Response:
Action:
- 35) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 4.3.4.2 Pg #: 4-14 Line #: 4 Code: c
Original Comment #:
Comment: The release of contaminants may occur during remediation regardless of the alternative selected. Please remove or rephrase this paragraph to better explain DOE's point.
Response:
Action:
- 36) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 4.3.4.2 Pg #: 4-14 Line #: 25 Code:
Original Comment #:
Comment: Negative pressure ventilation equipment fitted with HEPA filters.. Please change typo.
Response:
Action:
- 37) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 4.3.4.2 Pg #: 4-15 Line #: 11 Code:
Original Comment #:
Comment: Exposed populations would not be limited to threatened or endangered species. Common foraging animals such as the White-tailed deer which feed onsite and presumably, hunted and consumed offsite need to be kept in mind.

OEPA Comments
October 8, 1993
Page 7

Response:
Action:

38) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: 4.4.1 Pg #: 4-17 Line #: 19 Code:
Original Comment #:
Comment: Replace HEPA filters with . . . and HEPA filtration, as well . . .

Response:
Action:

39) Commenting Organization: Ohio EPA Commentor: KK
Section #: E.5 Pg #: E-8 Line #: 20-25 Code:
Original Comment #:
Comment: I am unsure of the meaning or intent of this paragraph.
What contaminated soil?
Response:
Action:

40) Section 3, pg. 3-6, line 9: The point should be made that engineering and containment controls will be taken prior to the start of D&D actions. The appearance in this section is that these actions would only be taken if the monitoring program detected an environmental release.

41) Section 3, pg. 3-10: It would seem advisable to recycle and dispose of materials as the D&D process occurs. A storage facility should only be necessary for material that we agree has the potential for on-site disposal.

42) Section 3, pg. 3-10: Is it possible that the CSF could be located, at the least in part, in the Plant 1 Pad area? The goal of the Plant 1 pad removal action is to prepare this area to accept and store remediation wastes. This assumes that the current waste stored there now would be shipped off site. It was Ohio EPA's understanding that removing the Plant 1 pad waste was a priority of DOE/FERMCO. It would seem to make more sense to use an existing part of the production area rather than build a new storage facility. This is especially true since the area north of the production area has the potential to be used for future disposal units.

43) Section 4, pg. 4-9, line 20: Is it possible that the decontaminated buildings would become contaminated again by being open to the environment at Fernald for the 10-20 years that D&D activities would take place? If this is possible, it would be worth discussing in this section.

/acp

08